

Response to Stephen B. Harris Esq. of HARRIS AND HARRIS Sanctions
Order, 12(b)(6) motions & violation of rules.
No.2:23-cv 05146-GEKP

Plaintiff Peter Sauers Pro-se Plaintiff

Vs.

Defendants Oak Property Management, Ashley Management Co.,
County Builders, Mike Meister, and Kevin Reilly

Rule 11 does not permit non- lawyers to be Sanctioned and
cannot be sanctioned for this reason as a Pro-se Plaintiff. "Sherar
v. Cullen, 481 F. 2d 946 (1973)" Federal Rules of Evidence the
American Anti-Corruption Act makes it illegal to purchase political
influence as Defendants Oak Property Management, Ashley
Management Co., County Builders, Mike Meister, and Kevin Reilly,
engaged / employed Township officials and one Judge in a
Conflict of interest the Defendants. Township administration
aware of the Unprofessional conduct, Conflict of interest,
Violations of state laws, Federal laws by means that it crosses
over from criminal activity of past Township administration
Defendants had full knowledge and took part in the criminal
activity.



Township administration and Defendants fully aware of the Unprofessional conduct, Conflict of interest, Violations of state laws, Federal laws by means that crossed over from criminal activity of past Township administration. Moreover 1.2(d) Affirmation of public office's was abuse of police powers for the Defendant's "Rule 1.4, shall consult with the client as to how they are to be pursued. A lawyer may take such action on behalf of the client as is impliedly authorized to conduct the representation. A lawyer shall abide by a client's decision whether to settle a matter. (b) representation of a client, including representation by appointment, does not constitute an endorsement of the client's political, economic, social, or moral views or activities". The New Township administration and Defendants had responsibilities to the Plaintiff. Sherar v. Cullen, 481 F. 2d 946 (1973) "There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of his exercise of constitutional rights." Plaintiff/ Victim notes Honorable Judge Gene E.K. Pratter acknowledged that a possible violations of the 14th Amendment in Notices moving this forward without prejudice to lower courts. Look for the original counsel actions.

Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. (2 Cranch) 137, 180 (1803) "... the particular phraseology of the constitution of the United States confirms and strengthens the principle, supposed to be essential to all - written constitutions, that a law repugnant to the constitution- is void, and that courts, as well as other departments, are bound by that instrument.", *Gibson*, 355 U. S. 41 (1957). The complaint should not be dismissed unless it appears that Plaintiff could "prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief." *Conley v. Gibson*, *supra*, at 355 U. S. 45-46. With these rules in mind, we turn to an examination of the allegations of Plaintiff complaint". The Honorable Judge Gene E.K. Pratter now has knowledge of fraud on the court in (1956) WALKER v. CITY OF HUTCHINSON ET AL. No. 13. Supreme Court of United States. Argued October 15-16, 1956. Decided December 10, 1956. The notice published in the official newspaper was not sufficient notice to satisfy the requirements of the Due Process clauses of both Federal and State Constitutions" Defendants required to notification to Plaintiff stated by J. Pratter.

Department of Labor and Industry opened an investigation into the Lower Southampton Zoning and Building Department because of the findings from the Keystone Report, which reviewed 26 representative sample building and zoning permits for irregularities and compliance with department procedures. 531 West Street Road Project and Oak Properties/Ashley Property Management explicitly named in the report, the Defendant's all Defendant's took part in "fraud on the court." The malpractice of Attorneys' Government Officials for Defendants activity on political channels has a conflict-of-interest. Actions date back to historical precedents in suits at common law allowing the Seventh Amendment. Violations of duties of Defendants with help from accomplices. Requests relief in civil damages and punitive damages heard under the Seventh Amendment.

The Seventh Amendment provides that in suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall "be preserved." Honorable Gene E.K. Pratters confirming that there are certain facts after convictions in her court by accomplice as argument of original counsel.

Anderson v. Warner, 451 F.3d 1063, 1067 (9th Cir. 2006). It provides that": "[e]very person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress". *City of Dallas v Mitchell*, 245 S.W. 944 "To take away all remedy for the enforcement of a right is to take away the right itself. The remedy for the enforcement in filings is Constitutional Rights, *Davis v. Wechsler*, 263 US 22, 24. "Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate them." All remedies of Constitutional Rights of Plaintiff claims Fraud, *Nudd v. Burrows*, 91 U.S 426. "Fraud vitiates everything" *Boyce v. Grundy*, 3 Pet. 210 "Fraud vitiates the most solemn contracts, documents and even judgments." Original counsel involved in fraud on the court.

EXHIBIT A: I took as a threat with Conflict of interest, Fraud on the court, Fraud, obstruction of justice and blatant lies though out for a stall to get to the Statute of limitations a matter of fact been sending motions every couple month from day one and relief has always had legal remedies. Please institute my Constitutional Rights under the Seventh Amendment, I also request that Stephen B. Harris Esq. release all necessary documents of his clients under the Rule 26(a): Parties are required to share evidence supporting their case without being requested by the opposite party. Public documents.

EXHIBIT B HAINES v. KERNER ET AL. Plaintiff: "Allegations, we conclude that he is entitled to an opportunity to offer proof. The judgment is reversed, and the case is remanded for further proceedings consistent herewith". Legal conclusions should entitle Plaintiff to an opportunity to offer proof also, in full use of outstanding Complain, Motions (s), Witness, and Evidence. trial by jury shall, "be preserved in common law and multiple constitutional rights.

Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544 (2007), was a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States involving antitrust law and civil procedure, established that parallel conduct, absent evidence of agreement, pleading requirement for civil cases. Requiring for Plaintiff include enough facts in their complaint to make it plausible, not merely possible. Plaintiff meets his burden from action recognized in Honorable Gene E.K. Pratters court with accomplices and Evidence from other cases Res judicata also in common law and Constitutional Rights.

Note: Full OBJECTION to Stephen B. Harris Esq. of HARRIS HARRIS Sanctions Order, 12(b)(6) Motion / Motions and his full Response his use of original counsel actions, rehashed. Arguments to a jury are ongoing to date and involve ethical misconduct conduct by Attorneys that are or were officers of the court relevant to The Court of Common Pleas, B.Platsky v. CIA, 953 F.2d 25, 26 28 (2nd Cir. 1991), "Court errs if court dismisses pro se litigant without instruction of how pleadings are deficient and how to repair pleadings."

Plaintiff reserves the right to amend and notes in this are all in original actions from lower courts now hold oxymorons relevant to this case and U.S.C. Fraud on the court" statute (28 § 2111), which requires courts to review cases for errors of law, Prejudicial error mistake about the law, court procedures that causes substantial harm to the Plaintiff. Victim of crimes have Rights 34 U.S. Code § 20141 - Services to victims is requested now in this Court. Fundamental fairness in fair procedures for Equal protection. I'm requesting help in preparing an oral and/or written victim impact statement detailing the physical, psychological, and economic effects of the crime, which will be considered by court. Uphold my constitutional rights taken by Defendants associated whit action of John Waltman, Michael J. Savona, Esq Township Solicitor, Michael E. Peters Esq on the bord for land transactions in Bucks County, Robert P. Hoopes Esq. Rule 7.1 will not remove jurisdiction of Constitutional Rights of rights, with Fraud and error in procedural History. Defendants are not above the law of Plaintiff rights.

JUNE 17, 2016, BEFORE: THE HONORABLE GENE E.K. PRATTER,
J. PRETRIAL CONFERENCE APPEARANCES: PETERS SAUERS Pro
Se Plaintiff EASTBURN AND GRAY, P.C. For Defendant MICHAEL E.
PETERS, ESQUIRE / (employed by Oak Property Management,
Ashley Management Co., County Builders, Mike Meister, and Kevin
Reilly). (Omission of Council to the Court). (Tc).

THE COURT Peters, I strongly recommend that you and your
colleagues,

Eastburn & Gray, call upon the Bar Association, the real
estate MR. PETERS: **I'm the chair of the Real Estate**
Committee so I'm happy to check into that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Would you, please --

MR. PETERS: I will.

THE COURT: -- invite Mr. Sauers to meet with an
independent lawyer interested in doing little pro bono good
service?

MR. PETERS: I will, Your Honor.

THE COURT: To walk him through some of the
technical features of real estate law and municipal zoning law
that appear to be matters of great concern to Mr. Sauers.

MR. PETERS: I'm pleased to do so.

MR. SAUERS: And thank you, Mr. Peters.

THE COURT: What?

MR. SAUERS: I said, "Thank you, Mr. Peters."

THE COURT: And I would say do that sooner than
later, because if you can save Mr. Sauers the work of going
through and trying to draft an Amended Complaint, that's good
for everybody.

Original Council lied to HONORABLE GENE E.K. PRATTER, Federal
Authorities, Judges, and other officials. Violating Pro Se Plaintiffs
Constitutional Rights. HONORABLE GENE E.K. PRATTER now has a
second bite at the apple with Plaintiffs Seventh Amendment, A
Victim of crimes is eligible for economic effects of the crime in
civil damages. Stephen B. Harris Esq is doubling down on Original
Council. A. Courts 12(b)(6) have been dismissed in similar cases.

DiSarrio v. Mills, 711 So.2d 1355 (Fla. 2d DCA 1998) Unsworn argument by counsel simply "is not evidence."

Verification PLAINTIFF/ PETER SAUERS Pro-se the Plaintiff verifies that he is representing himself in this action, and that the statements made in the forgoing is true and correct to the best of his knowledge, information and belief and the testimony and what's on record. He understands that false statements made herein are subject to the penalties of law. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend.



Plaintiff Peter Sauers Pro-se Plaintiff
32 N. Westview Avenue Feasterville, PA 19053
215 805-2421 Cell - Home 215 396-6811 Date 2 24 2024

\ Filed: United States District Court Eastern District of Pennsylvania
James A. Byrne U.S. Courthouse. 601 Market Street.
Philadelphia, PA

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy and copies of the foregoing will served upon Stephen B. Harris Esq. of HARRIS AND HARRIS 1760 Bristol Rd, Warrington, PA 18976 Phone: (215) 343-9000 US mail.



UNITED STATES
POSTAL SERVICE®

PRIORITY®
MAIL

RL

FROM:

PETER SAUERS
3213 WESTVIEW AVE.
FREASIERVILLE PA.
19053

This package is made from post-consumer waste. Please recycle - again.

FLAT RATE ENVELOPE
ONE RATE ■ ANY WEIGHT

TRACKED - MAIL

EXPECTED DELIVERY DAY: 02/26/24
USPS TRACKING® #



9505 5142 6953 4055 1148 02

To schedule free Package Pickup,
scan the QR code.



USPS.COM/PICKUP

2:23 CV 05146 GEKP
TO:
HONORABLE GENE K.
PRAITER S. COURT.
U.S. COURT HOUSE
601 MARKET STREET
PHILA. PA
19106